

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Viginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/898,124	07/05/2001	Quanbo Zou	IME01-001	2288	
28112 7	7590 05/07/2003				
GEORGE O. SAILE & ASSOCIATES			EXAMINER		
28 DAVIS AV POUGHKEEP	ENUE SIE, NY 12603		SIEW, JEFFREY		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1637	$\overline{\mathcal{A}}$	
			DATE MAILED: 05/07/2003	8	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application N .	Applicant(s)				
	09/898,124	ZOU ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
J	Jeffrey Siew	1637	•			
' The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	appears on the c ver sheet	with the correspondence address	s			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory peri - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by sta - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the ma earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status	N. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may reply within the statutory minimum of od will apply and will expire SIX (6) N tute, cause the application to become	v a reply be timely filed thirty (30) days will be considered timely. IONTHS from the mailing date of this commure ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nication.			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1	7 March 2003 .					
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)□	This action is non-final.					
Since this application is in condition for allocation closed in accordance with the practice und Disposition of Claims			erits is			
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-25</u> is/are pending in the applicat	ion.	•				
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withd						
5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-18</u> is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>19,20,24 and 25</u> is/are rejected.						
7)⊠ Claim(s) <u>21-23 and 26</u> is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	d/or election requirement.		•			
Application Papers	•					
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exami	iner.					
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>05 July 2001</u> is/are: a	a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objec	ted to by the Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to						
11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on		disapproved by the Examiner.				
If approved, corrected drawings are required in						
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner.	,				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120						
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore	eign priority under 35 U.S.	C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).				
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority docume	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No					
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the p application from the International * See the attached detailed Office action for a limited of the certified copies of the particular applications. 	Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)) .	je			
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).						
a) The translation of the foreign language	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •					
Attachment(s)	•					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s	5) D Notice	ew Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152				

Art Unit: 1637

DETAILED ACTION

THE FOLLOWING IS A NEW GROUND OF REJECTION NECESSITATED BY THE AMENDMENT

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 19, 24 & 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baier et al (US5,939,312 Aug. 17, 1999) in view of Hunicke –Smith US6132,996 (Oct. 17, 2000) in further view of Ackley et al (US5,733,509 March 31, 1998).

Baier et al teach a miniaturized multi chamber thermocycler (see whole doc. esp. abstract) which contains a heat sink (see figure 3, 41). They teach a chip (Figure 4) containing reaction chamber symmetrically overlies a single block. They teach that the the chip is made of

Art Unit: 1637

poor heat conductivity such as glass plates and SiO₂ which would provide for greater conductivity within a chamber than between chambers(see col.3 lines 1-15). They teach thermal conductive of 0.6 to 6 W/Km (see col. 3 line 23). They teach up to 6000sample chambers each with 0.1ul volume in one 4" inch wafer which would fall within the dimension range (see col.4 lines 5-10)

Baier et al do not teach sensor or a printed circuit to allow independent control or disposable chips.

<u>Hunicke – Smith</u> teach aprinted circuit (see col.11 line 45-60). They also teach temperature sensor (see col. 9 lines 32-35).

Ackley et al teach disposable chips (see col. 2 lines 1-8).

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to apply Hunicke-Smith's printed circuits to Baieer et al 's device in order to control independent and multiple PCR reactions. Hunicke-Smith state that multiple and separate reactions may be performed (see col. 10 line 43-50). It would have been <u>prima facie</u> obvious to apply Hunicke-Smith's printed circuit to Baier et al's device in order to perform a plurality of PCR reactions amplifying different targets simultaneously.

Moreover one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to apply Ackley et al's teaching of disposable chips to Baier et al's multi chamber device in order to provide premade arrays. As disposable chips were well known and practiced in the art, it would have been <u>prima facie</u> obvious to apply Ackley disposable chips to Baier et al's chamber in order to allow the practitioner to easily interchange different probe configurations to identify different targets.

Art Unit: 1637

2. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baier et al (US5,939,312 Aug. 17, 1999) in view of Hunicke –Smith US6132,996 (Oct. 17, 2000) and Ackley et al (US5,733,509) in futher view of Northrup et al (US5,639,423 June 17, 1997).

The teachings and suggestions of <u>Baier et al and Hunicke-Smith and Ackley et al</u> are described previously.

Baier et al do not teach a syringe.

Northrup et al teach a syringe to add samples (see Figure 1).

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to apply Northrup et al's teachnique of adding sample through a syringe to the combined invention fo Baier et al and Hunicke-Smith in order to sterilely add samples. It would have been <u>prima facie</u> obvious that adding sample through a syringe would provide efficient and sterile addition of PCR samples to the combined PCR invention of Baier et al and Hunicke-Smith.

SUMMARY

3. Claims 1-18 are allowable. Concerning claims 7-18 there is no prior art that teach or suggest the claimed apparatus with solder bumps extending downwards from array to provide electrical connections and means for uniformily pressing chip against blocks or the claimed device with heater and sensor on first block partially covered and partially exposed by second block.

Art Unit: 1637

Concerning claims 1-6 there is no prior art that teach or suggest the claimed device with soft layer softer than 100 and hard than 1 on Shore D Durometer.

Claims, 21, 22 & 23 & 76 are free of the prior art but objected to for depending on rejected claim. There is no prior art that teach the claimed device with chip sidewalls extending downward to touch printed circuit board forming airtight enclosure, or a claimed device with covering case and rods that extend downward to press down on chip or a claimed device with fixture in an inverted orientation with additional heat sink and printed circuit or a claimed device with a disposable chip.

The closest prior art is Baier et al who teach a chip for multiple samples but do not teach or suggest solder bumps, Shore D softness, chip sidewalls, covering case with rods, additional printed circuit in inverted orientation or a disposable chip.

Conclusion

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 1637

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey Siew whose telephone number is (703) 305-3886 and whose e-mail address is Jeffrey. Siew@uspto.gov. However, the office cannot guarantee security through the e-mail system nor should official papers be transmitted through this route. The examiner is on flex-time schedule and can best be reached on weekdays from 6:30 a.m. to 3 p.m. If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Benzion, can be reached on (703)-308-1119.

Any inquiry of a general nature, matching or filed papers or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the <u>Tracey Johnson</u> for Art Unit 1637 whose telephone number is (703)-305-2982.

Papers related to this application may be submitted to Group 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Group 1600 via the PTO Fax Center located in Crystal Mall 1. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989). The CM1 Center numbers for Group 1600 are Voice (703) 308-3290 and Before Final FAX (703) 872-9306 or After Final FAX (703) 30872-9307.

JEFFREY SIEW PRIMARY EXAMINER